



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

On another occasion I hope to present some points of interest as regards the variant readings of the manuscript and the authorized editions.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

### OLD ENGLISH PROSE WRITERS.

*Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers.* Edited with the Vulgate and other Latin Originals, Introduction on Old English Biblical Versions, Index of Biblical Passages, and Index of Principal Words, by ALBERT S. COOK, Hon. M. S. (Yale), Ph. D. (Jena), L.H.D. (Rutgers), Professor of the English Language and Literature in Yale University, President of the Modern Language Association of America. London: Macmillan & Co., New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898.

THE value of this contribution to our knowledge of Old English Biblical translations, very inadequately represented in the modest title, "Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers," can only be estimated when we consider the meagerness of the manuscript remains of Old English Biblical translation. The common explanation refers our poverty in manuscripts to the ravages of the Danes, and the neglect and contempt of the Normans; but that any prevalent translation, or even sporadic translations of individual or local interest, except such as are ascribed to Bæda, were made is left to pure conjecture. All that we have, seem to limit direct translation to the necessities of church service--the Psalter, Paternoster, Canticles, and Lectionary. The references to Old English learning in the *Pastoral Care* and Ælfric's *Homilies* discourage the belief in the existence of translations beyond those which have been preserved.

Skeat can say, from a critical comparison of the manuscripts of the Gospels in the preface to his edition of Luke:

"We are irresistably led to conclude that perhaps not very many copies have perished, they may never have been very numerous, and there is at present not the faintest trace of any other version."

These results differ from what he expected. Bright, in his introduction to St. Luke, in reference to Bæda's translation, says:

"There is no ground for supposing that any book of the new testament was again translated into the language of the people until the only extant version of the gospels was prepared in the last quarter of the tenth Century."

In this unsettled state of our knowledge we can appreciate the recovery of lost or neglected manuscripts, or unnoticed translations.

Attention was turned but a few years ago, and then only incidentally, to the existence of translation in Biblical quotations. In Forshall and Madden's review of Biblical translations, in their preface to Wyckliffe's works, 1850, Biblical quotations in Old English writers are included in the remains of translation; and Wichmann made use of quotations from the Psalms in the *Pastoral Care* in his review, in the *Anglia*, of Alfred's translation; but that Old English Biblical translations might be recovered from Old English writers, as the original scriptures are recoverable from quotations in Patristic literature, has received its first distinct practical recognition in this collection of Dr. Cook's. It has the value of a "find." How far it may throw light upon the question of the existence of an Old English *textus receptus* remains for future study, to which this collection may incite scholars.

We have in Dr. Cook's work the first installment of express and formal quotations or extracts and references to Biblical summaries and condensed Biblical passages in all of Alfred's and most of Ælfric's prose: the *Pastoral Care*, the *Laws*, *Orosius*, the *Ecclesiastical History*, and Ælfric's *Homilies*. Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, Ælfric's *Sigwulf's Interrogationes*, the *Benedictine Rule*, the *Blickling Homilies*, and other prose, are left to future examination. Although the collection is limited to quotations in O.E. prose, passages in O. E. poetry which pass from paraphrase to direct translation, are introduced in the Conspectus. These are very few.

The results are surprising; all the books of the Bible are represented, except Ruth, Nehemiah, Esther, Obadiah, and Nahum, in the O. T., and Philemon, second and third John, and Jude, in the N.T. In Alfred's writings, the *Pastoral Care* furnishes the largest number, the *Ecclesiastical History* a very few, owing to the fragmentary and selective character of

Alfred's translation, *Orosius* supplies only references, although in these references we have Biblical diction. To these we may expect a large addition when the other prose is examined.

From a collation of this collection of the quotations in the P.C. with another independently made, confirmed by a careful review, we may justly conclude that Dr. Cook's collection is exhaustive and accurate. The same judgment may be applied, from partial, but careful, examination to the entire work. O.E. texts, recognized as the best by all scholars, are used; and the collection is made serviceable by accurate references to text and passage. An index of Biblical passages, and an index of principal words provide for the thorough and easy use of the collection, as a chrestomathy and as material in semasiology.

With the O.E. translation in the quotations is added and printed, at the foot of the page, the Latin originals of Alfred's writings with the variants of the Latin versions, and the Vulgate for Ælfric's *Homilies*. The relations of Ælfric's *Homilies* to their Latin originals, according to Dr. Cook, "have been too little investigated to admit of a present determination of the amount of this variation." The value of the collection, especially in its use as a chrestomathy and in semasiology is so far dependent upon the determination of the original, that the quotations from Ælfric, though very rich, will be less serviceable than those from Alfred's writings. Max Förster's study in the originals of the *Homilies*, in the *Anglia*, opens the investigation which may lead to a satisfactory determination. Much may be expected from Bishop Wordsworth's work upon the Vulgate, soon to be placed at the service of scholars.

The Latin originals and texts show the same careful treatment given to the O.E. texts. Dr. Cook has incorporated the variants and references to versions other than the Vulgate. He has provided a text which should receive the approval of the Biblical critic.

In estimating the value of the quotations as translations, it must be noted that most of the O.E. quotations are quotations of quotations. They give the translation of the original at second hand. The translation,

moreover, is with a freedom which runs into exposition. Ælfric's translation is exceedingly variable in the use of the same quotations in different passages. From this practice, it would seem that no *textus receptus* governed the O.E. translator, except the tradition of an oral translation which must have arisen in the course of Bible instruction. This does not lessen the value of the collection in its use as a Chrestomathy, for which it offers a mass of material of wide range and great variety.

Dr. Cook calls attention to the use of the collection in the neglected department of O.E. semasiology, for which the quotations possess a value over much O.E. Biblical literature, in the certainty we enjoy as to dates and authorship. As known quantities they will have great weight in the settlement of questions relating to the place of much that is at present undetermined. The quotations, supplemented by a collection of citations of Biblical and ethical diction, will go far in showing the creation, development, and range of the O.E. religious and ethical dialect.

Dr. Cook has given completeness to the work and shown the place in the history of Biblical translation filled by the quotations, in an admirable conspectus of O.E. Biblical literature, which may justly claim to be the first critical review of the entire field, bringing together what we have scattered in Wanley, and Wülker's *Grundriss*, and in numerous monographs. It serves a use beyond that of an introduction to the quotations, and deserves to be published in a separate edition. It embraces an historical and critical review of the Biblical poetry and prose from the seventh century, in paraphrase, gloss, and translation. The bibliography is very full. The controverted questions are carefully presented, traditions of authorship are traced to their origin and foundation. Their introduction into histories of O.E. literature, in which they have been repeated by respectable authors, without verification is now made inexcusable. A notable instance is shown in the account of Guthlac's version of the Psalms.

The reference of the poetical division of the *Paris Psalter* to Aldhelm, Dr. Cook rejects on the basis of Miss Helen Bartlett's study; he gives it a place, on very good grounds, in the

middle of the tenth century, between the *Menologium* and the Benedictine *Officium*.

Dr. Cook is unwilling wholly to surrender the Alfredian authorship of the prose division of the Psalter. He gives Bruce's view that it was the work of an ignorant priest, soon, if at all, after the date of Alfred; and Wülfing's view that it was the work of Alfred, on the basis of a statement of William of Malmesbury. Whilst acknowledging that there is no resemblance between the *Paris Psalter* and Alfred's undoubted works, he finds in two passages, in two usages peculiar to Alfred a slender foundation. "It will require," says Dr. Cook,

"a more comprehensive and detailed examination to decide whether Alfred is really to be credited with the translation of all the prose Psalms extant." "There is nothing in Bruce's arguments which necessarily militates against the theory of Alfredian authorship, since it is notorious that the king was assisted by clerical collaborators in much of his scholarly activity."

The Northumbrian glosses receive in the *Conspectus*, as might be expected from Dr. Cook's special studies, a very full treatment in a most interesting account.

No where else will the scholar find so full and complete a statement of Ælfric's identity, in which as to the date of the *Homilies* (889-890) an error, no doubt typographical, occurs.

No question of importance in the history of O.E. Biblical literature is left untouched; upon each is given a statement more full and complete than can be found elsewhere. It brings the achievements of O.E. scholarship down to the present, and so provides for the "Advancement of O.E. Learning."

It is in this connection that we have the most important service of the collection of Biblical Quotations in the light thrown by them upon the method and extent of Biblical instruction in the O.E. Church. These questions are left in obscurity in Lingard, Soames, and other writers.

A cursory examination of the quotations, which are of the tenth century, seem to support the view that the Bible was not first given to the Angles and Saxons in direct translation. The conditions which led to the first Teutonic version of Ulfilas from the original Greek had passed away at the time of the conversion of the Saxons. The Latin versions had acquired

the sacredness and authority to a high degree they have since enjoyed in the Roman communion. The Anglo-Saxon clergy would be disposed to acquire a knowledge of the scriptures first in the study of the Latin version. In the popular instruction, use would naturally be made of the existing institution of minstrelsy in poetical paraphrase, and the oral exposition of the preacher. In this way a scriptural diction and phrase would arise. The necessities of the church service would call for the translation of those parts of the scripture which belong to the people in the liturgy, the Psalter, Canticles, the Paternoster, as Bæda's injunction to Egbert would seem to support. The neglect and ignorance of Latin among the clergy of the ninth century would give rise to the glosses. Not until the tenth century, in the closing period of O.E. literature, have we known efforts at direct translation into the vernacular, and these find their moving cause in the lectionary of the church service. The quotations seem to show, in the freedom and independence in which they are made, that down into the tenth century, no vernacular translation beyond traditional oral usage had become recognized in any one version.

Dr. Cook's work opens a rich mine of material, and in the fine scholarship in which it is edited, is a most valuable contribution to O.E. studies.

CHARLES EDWARD HART.

*Rutgers College.*

---

### ENGLISH POETRY.

*Milton's Paradise Lost*; Its Structure and Meaning, by JOHN A. HINES, Professor of English in Pennsylvania College. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1898.

PROFESSOR HINES informs us that the views embodied in this work came upon him as a genuine surprise, and we may be pretty sure that there is much about them that will be surprising to the reader. He assures us that despite all the study bestowed upon it, *Paradise Lost* "is even now but poorly understood;" and certainly, if his interpretations be correct, he has put the case very mildly—he might have said "is not understood by anybody."